



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/714,941	11/20/2000	Arto Astala	017.38955X00	7366

20457 7590 11/17/2004

ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP  
1300 NORTH SEVENTEENTH STREET  
SUITE 1800  
ARLINGTON, VA 22209-9889

EXAMINER

WU, XIAO MIN

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2674

DATE MAILED: 11/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/714,941	<b>Applicant(s)</b> ASTALA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> XIAO M. WU	<b>Art Unit</b> 2674	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 July 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-36 and 38-99 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-36,38-50,57,60-64,68-72,76-80,84-88 and 92-96 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 51-56,58,59,65-67,73-75,81-83,89-91 and 97-99 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                        | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
3. Claims 1, 6-11, 14-21, 24-30, 33-36, 38-41, 43-50, 57, 60-64, 68-72, 76-80, 84-88, 92-96 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roundtree et al. (Pub. No. US 2002/0002594) in view of Araki et al. (US Patent No. 4,899,138).

As to claims 1, 9-11, 17-21, 27, 28-30, 36, 57, Roundtree discloses a method of inputting data at a wireless device (120, Fig. 4) using a touch screen (page. 4, [0041]), the method comprising: receiving configuration information at the wireless device from a server to configure user profile specific user interface settings and/or terminal specific user interface settings (page 5, [0050], 0052)) detecting an object (e.g. stylus or fingers) touching the touch screen. It is inherent that the touch screen including the sensor for detecting the location of the object on the

Art Unit: 2674

touch screen and detecting x and y coordinates of a point of contact of the object on the touch screen. It is noted that Roundtree does not disclose “detecting when the object is no longer touching the touch screen and measuring a time duration from the time of detection of the object first touching the touch screen until the time of detection of the object no longer touching the touch screen; and determining inputted data based on the detected location of the object on the touch screen and the measured time. Araki is cited to teach a touch screen input device similar to Allard. Araki teaches detecting when the object is no longer touching the touch screen and measuring a time duration from the time of detection of the object first touching the touch screen until the time of detection of the object no longer touching the touch screen (see col. 5, line 64 to col. 6, line 14); and determining inputted data based on the detected location of the object on the touch screen and the measured time duration (see col. 2, lines 20-39). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the touch screen of Roundtree with the features of measuring the touch period as taught by Araki so as to select an operation mode for an electronic device according to how the finger touches the touch panel (col. 2, lines 19-20).

As to claims 43-50, noted the discussion of Roundtree and Araki above. Roundtree further discloses a mobile display appliance server (76, Fig. 2), a business site (80), a management server (68, Fig. 2), a service provider (80), a network address of the global address server (70, 78), an application server (76), a profile services (38, Fig. 1), an advertisement service (80, Fig. 2).

As to claims 6, 14, 24, 33, Araki discloses measuring the time duration comprising determining whether or not the time duration is greater than a predetermined value (col. 6, line 7).

As to claims 7, 15, 25, 34, Araki discloses measuring the time duration comprising determining whether the time duration is less than or equal to a first predetermined value or greater than the first predetermined value and less than or equal to second predetermined value or greater than second predetermined value (col. 6, lines 5-7).

As to claims 8, 16, 26, 35, Araki discloses measuring the time duration comprising determining which of a predetermined plurality of time duration ranges the measured time duration is within (col. 6, lines 5-7).

As to claims 38-41, Roundtree discloses the server receives the configuration information from a configuration manager of management server (68, Fig. 2).

As to claim 60-64, 68-72, 76-80, 84-88, 92-96, Roundtree discloses authenticating the wireless device by the serve. For example, a private credit card service module 28 can provide for secure order processing for the request to help safeguard user's personal information such as credit numbers.

4. Claim 42 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roundtree et al. (Pub. No. US 2002/0002594) in view of Araki et al. (US Patent No. 4,899,138 as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Allard et al (US Patent No. 5,615,384).

As to claim 42, it is noted that Roundtree and Araki do not specifically disclose determining inputted data corresponds to magnifying a hidden text under a touch input. Allard is cited to teach a wireless communication device including a touch screen similar to Roundtree. Allard further discloses determining inputted data corresponds to magnifying a hidden text under a touch input (see Fig. 6). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Roundtree and Araki with the features of the magnifying a touch point as taught by

Art Unit: 2674

Allard so as to see the interested information more easily and more efficiently from a small screen.

5. Claims 4, 5, 12, 13, 22, 23, 31, 32 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roundtree et al. (Pub. No. US 2002/0002594) in view of Araki et al. (US Patent No. 4,899,138 as applied to claims 1, 6-11, 14-21, 24-30, 33-36, 38-42 above, and further in view of Dunthorn (US Patent No. 4,914,624)

It is noted that Araki does not specifically disclose detecting pressure of the object on the touch screen being greater than a predetermined. Dunthorn is cited to teach a touch screen input device in which comprises detecting pressure of the object on the touch screen being greater than a predetermined (e.g. increasing the pressure of touch, see col. 6, line 66 to col. 7, line 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Araki with the features of pressure determination as taught by Dunthorn so as to increase the touch function by using different pressure values.

#### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

6. Claims 51-56, 58-59, 65-67, 73-75, 81-83, 89-91, 97-99 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicant's arguments filed 7/30/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Roundtree does not disclose "receiving configuration information at the wireless device from a first server to configure user profile-specific user

Art Unit: 2674

interface setting and/or terminal specific user interface settings". This argument is not persuasive because Roundtree clearly discloses rendering instruction (user interface setting, such as types of data, color ,size, a type of user device, operating system for the user device) can be accessed remotely at the system serve (see page 5).

***Conclusion***

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Xiao Wu whose telephone number is (703) 305-4721.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Shalwala Bipin**, can be reached on (703) 305-4938.

**Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
Washington, D.C. 20231

Art Unit: 2674

**or faxed to:**


**(703) 872-9306**

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377

xw

November 14, 2004

  
**XIAO WU**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**  
**ART UNIT 2674**